

Thurrock: A place of opportunity, enterprise and excellence, where individuals, communities and businesses flourish

Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

The meeting will be held at **6.00 pm** on **19 February 2018**

Committee Room 1, Civic Offices, New Road, Grays, Essex, RM17 6SL

Membership:

Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), John Allen, Roy Jones, Tom Kelly, Steve Liddiard, Brian Little, Bukky Okunade and Terry Piccolo

Matt Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative
Linda Mulley, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Business Representative
Westley Mercer, Thurrock Business Board Representative

Substitutes:

Councillors Chris Baker, Colin Churchman, Gary Collins, Oliver Gerrish, Clifford Holloway, Joycelyn Redsell, Sue Sammons and Graham Snell

Agenda

Open to Public and Press

	Page
1 Apologies for Absence	
2 Minutes	5 - 12
To approve as a correct record the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 22 January 2018.	
3 Items of Urgent Business	
To receive additional items that the Chair is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency, in accordance with Section 100B (4) (b) of the Local Government Act 1972.	
4 Declaration of Interests	

5	Update on liaison with Highways England	13 - 14
6	Highways England Action List	15 - 20
7	Highways England Update - Visual Impact	
8	Lower Thames Crossing Task Force Priorities Update	21 - 24
9	Lower Thames Crossing Resource Requirements	25 - 26
10	Work Programme	27 - 28

Queries regarding this Agenda or notification of apologies:

Please contact Lottie Raper, Democratic Services Officer by sending an email to direct.democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Agenda published on: **12 February 2018**

Information for members of the public and councillors

Access to Information and Meetings

Members of the public can attend all meetings of the council and its committees and have the right to see the agenda, which will be published no later than 5 working days before the meeting, and minutes once they are published.

Recording of meetings

This meeting may be recorded for transmission and publication on the Council's website. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is to be recorded.

Members of the public not wishing any speech or address to be recorded for publication to the Internet should contact Democratic Services to discuss any concerns.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk

Guidelines on filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings

The council welcomes the filming, photography, recording and use of social media at council and committee meetings as a means of reporting on its proceedings because it helps to make the council more transparent and accountable to its local communities.

If you wish to film or photograph the proceedings of a meeting and have any special requirements or are intending to bring in large equipment please contact the Communications Team at CommunicationsTeam@thurrock.gov.uk before the meeting. The Chair of the meeting will then be consulted and their agreement sought to any specific request made.

Where members of the public use a laptop, tablet device, smart phone or similar devices to use social media, make recordings or take photographs these devices must be set to 'silent' mode to avoid interrupting proceedings of the council or committee.

The use of flash photography or additional lighting may be allowed provided it has been discussed prior to the meeting and agreement reached to ensure that it will not disrupt proceedings.

The Chair of the meeting may terminate or suspend filming, photography, recording and use of social media if any of these activities, in their opinion, are disrupting proceedings at the meeting.

Thurrock Council Wi-Fi

Wi-Fi is available throughout the Civic Offices. You can access Wi-Fi on your device by simply turning on the Wi-Fi on your laptop, Smartphone or tablet.

- You should connect to TBC-CIVIC
- Enter the password **Thurrock** to connect to/join the Wi-Fi network.
- A Terms & Conditions page should appear and you have to accept these before you can begin using Wi-Fi. Some devices require you to access your browser to bring up the Terms & Conditions page, which you must accept.

The ICT department can offer support for council owned devices only.

Evacuation Procedures

In the case of an emergency, you should evacuate the building using the nearest available exit and congregate at the assembly point at Kings Walk.

How to view this agenda on a tablet device



You can view the agenda on your [iPad](#), [Android Device](#) or [Blackberry Playbook](#) with the free modern.gov app.

Members of the Council should ensure that their device is sufficiently charged, although a limited number of charging points will be available in Members Services.

To view any “exempt” information that may be included on the agenda for this meeting, Councillors should:

- Access the modern.gov app
- Enter your username and password

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

Breaching those parts identified as a pecuniary interest is potentially a criminal offence

Helpful Reminders for Members

- *Is your register of interests up to date?*
- *In particular have you declared to the Monitoring Officer all disclosable pecuniary interests?*
- *Have you checked the register to ensure that they have been recorded correctly?*

When should you declare an interest *at a meeting*?

- **What matters are being discussed at the meeting?** (including Council, Cabinet, Committees, Subs, Joint Committees and Joint Subs); or
- If you are a Cabinet Member making decisions other than in Cabinet **what matter is before you for single member decision?**



Does the business to be transacted at the meeting

- relate to; or
- likely to affect

any of your registered interests and in particular any of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interests?

Disclosable Pecuniary Interests shall include your interests or those of:

- your spouse or civil partner's
- a person you are living with as husband/ wife
- a person you are living with as if you were civil partners

where you are aware that this other person has the interest.

A detailed description of a disclosable pecuniary interest is included in the Members Code of Conduct at Chapter 7 of the Constitution. **Please seek advice from the Monitoring Officer about disclosable pecuniary interests.**

What is a Non-Pecuniary interest? – this is an interest which is not pecuniary (as defined) but is nonetheless so significant that a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts, would reasonably regard to be so significant that it would materially impact upon your judgement of the public interest.

Pecuniary

If the interest is not already in the register you must (unless the interest has been agreed by the Monitoring Officer to be sensitive) disclose the existence and nature of the interest to the meeting

If the Interest is not entered in the register and is not the subject of a pending notification you must within 28 days notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest for inclusion in the register

Unless you have received dispensation upon previous application from the Monitoring Officer, you must:

- **Not participate or participate further in any discussion of the matter at a meeting;**
- **Not participate in any vote or further vote taken at the meeting; and**
- **leave the room while the item is being considered/voted upon**

If you are a Cabinet Member you may make arrangements for the matter to be dealt with by a third person but take no further steps

Non-pecuniary

Declare the nature and extent of your interest including enough detail to allow a member of the public to understand its nature



You may participate and vote in the usual way but you should seek advice on Predetermination and Bias from the Monitoring Officer.

Vision: Thurrock: A place of **opportunity**, **enterprise** and **excellence**, where **individuals**, **communities** and **businesses** flourish.

To achieve our vision, we have identified five strategic priorities:

1. Create a great place for learning and opportunity

- Ensure that every place of learning is rated “Good” or better
- Raise levels of aspiration and attainment so that residents can take advantage of local job opportunities
- Support families to give children the best possible start in life

2. Encourage and promote job creation and economic prosperity

- Promote Thurrock and encourage inward investment to enable and sustain growth
- Support business and develop the local skilled workforce they require
- Work with partners to secure improved infrastructure and built environment

3. Build pride, responsibility and respect

- Create welcoming, safe, and resilient communities which value fairness
- Work in partnership with communities to help them take responsibility for shaping their quality of life
- Empower residents through choice and independence to improve their health and well-being

4. Improve health and well-being

- Ensure people stay healthy longer, adding years to life and life to years
- Reduce inequalities in health and well-being and safeguard the most vulnerable people with timely intervention and care accessed closer to home
- Enhance quality of life through improved housing, employment and opportunity

5. Promote and protect our clean and green environment

- Enhance access to Thurrock's river frontage, cultural assets and leisure opportunities
- Promote Thurrock's natural environment and biodiversity
- Inspire high quality design and standards in our buildings and public space

Minutes of the Meeting of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force held on 22 January 2018 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillors Peter Smith (Chair), John Allen, Roy Jones, Steve Liddiard, Brian Little and Clifford Holloway (Substitute)

Linda Mulley, Resident Representative
Peter Ward, Thurrock Business Representative

Apologies: Councillors Gerard Rice (Vice-Chair), Tom Kelly, Bukky Okunade and Terry Piccolo

Matt Jackson, Thames Crossing Action Group Representative

In attendance: Lyn Carpenter, Chief Executive
Steve Cox, Corporate Director Place
Ian Wake, Director of Public Health
Fred Raphael, Transport Development Manager
Dr Kim Yates, Independent Technical Advisor on Environmental Issues
Charlotte Raper, Democratic Services Officer

Tim Jones, Highways England
Gary Hodges, Highways England
Robert Audsley, Highways England
Ian Kennard, Highways England

Before the start of the Meeting, all present were advised that the meeting may be filmed and was being recorded, with the audio recording to be made available on the Council's website.

35. Minutes

The resident representative noted an error on page 6 of the agenda. The minutes of item 30: Highways England Update read 'The representative from Highways England advised there were any constraints around height or location' and so she sought clarity as to the correct meaning. It was confirmed that the Democratic Services Officer would clarify.

The minutes should read '*The representative from Highways England advised there were many constraints around height or location*'.

Subject to those amendments, the minutes of the Lower Thames Crossing Task Force meeting held on 18 December 2017 were approved as a correct record.

36. Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

37. Declaration of Interests

It was declared that, as residents of Thurrock, all Members of the Task Force had an interest in the Lower Thames Crossing Scheme.

38. Update on liaison with Highways England

The Corporate Director of Place informed the Task Force that the update provided a summary of liaison between Council Officers and Highways England, as promised at the previous meeting of the Task Force to ensure transparency. It had been agreed that the Task Force agendas would be themed moving forward to help focus discussion and whilst Officers would need to have technical meetings with Highways England they would take a clear lead from the Task Force as to its key priorities.

There had also been meetings between Highways England and various Ward Councillors. The Chair invited any such Ward Councillors present to outline the key points of these meetings to the Task Force.

Councillor Jones felt that his meeting had been positive in terms of plans for public meetings and engagement opportunities moving forward. He stressed that he wanted Thurrock to be given the same considerations as Kent in terms of making the scheme more pleasing to the eye through tunnels and banks and also reminded Highways England that residents were angry about the scheme so it was crucial that the consultation process would ensure they were listened to and informed regarding key issues such as the elevation of the route, noise and pollution.

Councillor Little agreed that meetings with Highways England had been fruitful; it was possible to see changes from the original design in the most recent map. There were still some issues but it would be more productive to cover those in more detail at the themed meetings moving forward. He also urged as many Ward Councillors as possible to attend and actively engage with the process.

Councillor Liddiard added that he was very keen to look at the expected traffic flows for the future particularly in his area, Tilbury. He also wanted to ensure that spoil from the tunnelling would be disposed of in the best way, without too high a level of HGV movements. He stressed the need for Ward Councillors to be aware before works began that would directly affect their wards so they could pre-warn residents, which would generally make them calmer. The meeting had been positive and Highways England took away several points of concern had he mentioned.

The resident representative queried the outcome of Members being asked for their key priorities following the previous meeting and was advised that this had informed Item 7: Task Force Priorities.

39. Highways England Action List

Representatives from Highways England outlined the key points of the updated action list. In addition to responding to the action list they had agreed to update Ward Councillors of anything pertaining to the scheme which would affect their ward directly. Further on in the agenda they would update the Task Force on areas of influence within the scheme, though some aspects would be more technical and would be covered within meetings with Council Officers.

Councillor Allen noted that the scheme would cost approximately £6bn and asked whether contacts would be put out for tender or if there was a specific company already chosen. He echoed his comments from previous meetings that he felt it would be best to spend more in the scheme to reduce impacts on the health and wellbeing of residents as much as possible. Members heard that the full details of the procurement would be significant. A notice had been put out for suppliers to register their interest, with a deadline of 31 January 2018, which would be followed by a number of procurement activities and one-to-ones. The procurement process, for both finance and contractors, would officially begin in autumn 2018 and continue through to 2021.

Councillor Little expressed concern at discussing plans for the A1089 as he felt it muddied the waters. Until the scheme, if it went ahead, were operational the full impact upon the local road network could not be known and these conversations should therefore not be underway at this point in time.

40. Review of Task Force Priorities

The Corporate Director of Place informed the Task Force that, following the previous meeting, Members had been asked to provide their top areas of focus. The responses had been collated into thematic areas and the list of priorities would be important moving forward to assist focus discussions and provide a steer for Officers in technical meetings with Highways England regarding the scheme impact and potential mitigation measures. With this in mind Members of the Task Force were asked to confirm that they were satisfied that their responses were reflected accurately and suggest any amendments if necessary.

The Chair suggested that the item be added to the work programme for the next meeting, as more details regarding the visual impact of the scheme would be brought forward then.

41. Highways England Update: How and When can Thurrock shape Proposals?

Representatives from Highways England presented the update, to provide clarity around the level of engagement and influence opportunities available to the Council and Task Force. Positive interaction would help the shape the project and provide suitable mitigation. The Task Force heard that the scheme was still under development; the alignment had already been lowered from the original proposal to mitigate the visual impact and everything would be looked at in greater detail, providing Thurrock Council with an opportunity to engage.

There were some 'Project led decisions' which were unmovable. Highways England would be happy to discuss these areas with Officers; however they were not subject to much influence such as the viaduct over the Mardyke Valley.

The Chair sought clarification around this point. He questioned whether there was any possibility of tunnelling under the Orsett Fens and it was confirmed that this would not be possible. The Chair welcomed a definitive answer as Members needed to be told what would be unmovable.

The resident representative noted that the horizontal/vertical alignment of the route was listed as a 'project led decision'. She questioned the point further as this implied that local communities would have no say on whether sections of the route were tunnelled or put within cut and cover, as they had previously been led to believe. Highways England advised that the topography of the land would cause limitations but over the past 3-4 months they had sought to ensure the whole scheme was as low as it could be to minimise the visual intrusion, such as the A13 junction would be constructed beneath the existing A13. There would be some sections however with engineering and economic constraints that meant it would not be possible for residents to influence.

The resident representative expressed her horror. One of the key issues was the visual impact upon residents and wildlife and it appeared there would be no choice in the matter, which was not what the Task Force had been led to believe. Highways England advised that, in broad principle, much had been done to mitigate the effects of visual intrusion and moving forward, while the actual alignment of the road might not change, the surrounding area could provide further disguise. The use of tunnels and cuts however were project led decisions and had already been made, such as the viaduct across the Mardyke.

Councillor Jones thanked the representatives from Highways England for being frank and questioned what could be influenced. He was concerned that Members were wasting their time in discussions, such as around near residential areas, if the decisions had already been made. This should be made more clearly at the next meeting. Councillor Jones requested that full details of which sections were still possible for influence and which were not be brought to the next meeting. The Chair highlighted that the purpose of

tonight's meeting was to draw out such information and reiterated that the Council was opposed to any further crossings in Thurrock.

Councillor Little urged Highways England to present business cases to support any decision which could not be influenced, be they based on financial, environmental, or engineering grounds. This would allow the Task Force, and officers, to judge decisions from an informed stance, and Highways England accepted the challenge. He also sought assurances that there would be benefits to local employment through the project and that there would be close attention paid to local congestion, both during the construction phase and for years to come. If the project were to go ahead Thurrock would face 10 years of construction and it was crucial that Highways England were on board.

The business representative stressed the importance of managing construction so that existing businesses were not disrupted; not only the Port of Tilbury but Lakeside had voiced concerns regarding congestion. He reiterated Councillor Little's previous point about the A1089 which needed to be a post operational decision. Any degradation of the local rail network would be detrimental to businesses.

The Chair queried the exit point from the tunnel, and whether there would or would not be an opportunity to extend the tunnel to north of the railway. He also questioned the potential impact around links to Tilbury. Currently Highways England were still reviewing their options for the Northern Portal and how to move forward. There would be implications on the junction whether north or south of the railway which did put some limit on how much it could be moved. While representatives from Highways England were happy to listen to comments it would not be an easy solution due to ground conditions and disruptions to rail and road networks. At present they were wavering towards staying as intended and facing the ground conditions however officers and the Task Force would be talked through it all at the next meeting.

Councillor Allen stressed that the design of the scheme would be key in terms of health and environmental impacts. He didn't want the scheme to have huge impacts just because it was the cheapest option and reiterated his plea for Highways England to spend money to safeguard residents of Thurrock.

The resident representative asked what exactly Highways England would be consulting on, given the unmovable project led decisions. To her mind there was no room for consultation as residents could not influence decisions around the main areas of concern. Issues such as noise pollution, light pollution, air pollution and visual impact could not be consulted upon if decisions were already made. The representatives from Highways England assured Members that there were a number of areas for consultation such as construction impacts, use of spoil, mitigate visual impact through treatments and use of more sympathetic materials, landscaping etc. Even if the alignment could not be changed there would be lots around the road to consult upon. The vertical and horizontal alignments made the scheme work, and would be

presented in more detail in February. They confirmed that they were happy to go through reasons for decisions as requested by Councillor Little. The consultation was about impact and what needed to be taken on board if alignment remained as is. Highways England had already begun to look at red line because there was space to move it, away from certain houses, businesses and away from the site of a potential school to be built.

Councillor Allen stressed that, whilst the visual impact could be mitigated or disguised, elevated sections would still cause noise and pollution, both of which would have a negative impact on the health and wellbeing of local residents. At the next meeting there would be visual representations of the proposed route and specific areas of concern could be discussed then to focus attention effectively.

Councillor Holloway noted that the scheme would disrupt both the C2C commuter line and the freight line from the Port of Tilbury. He sought assurance that consultations were underway with Network Rail to mitigate against isolations and possessions required. Highways England were engaging with Network Rail with the aim of mitigating any impact to ongoing operations.

The business representative asked what Highways England envisaged in terms of benefits for the local community as a result of the scheme. Highways England were keen to develop the idea of 'legacy' with improved employment to local companies, more access to open space and enhancements to the local environment and public rights of way.

The business representative questioned whether local procurement would be considered wherever possible, as he felt this was an important factor. The representative from Highways England stated that an awful lot of tea bags, milk and newspapers would need to be supplied to keep the project running. There would be opportunities for local businesses but this would need to be balanced with sustainability. Highways England were cautious not to create businesses entirely dependent upon the scheme, at risk of falling once the project was complete. This was a significant area for further debate at a later stage. Councillors would be able to influence schools and colleges and there were a number of not for profit organisations offering the possibility of training in civil engineering and similar areas, particularly for girls and other diverse groups. It was hoped that local businesses would provide a big platform, especially given proximity to the Port of Tilbury. The Chair noted that training would be welcome, should the decision be made that the scheme would go ahead.

Councillor Jones sought clarification around the junction under the A13. It was confirmed that the junction would not be tunnelled but constructed underneath the existing A13. Visuals would be provided at the next Task Force meeting. Councillor Jones continued to question the 'No pre-PRA options' within the project led decisions section. Highways England would not go back to previous route options from before the Preferred Route

Announcement. Councillor Jones summarised that until the next meeting Members would remain uncertain exactly what could be done.

42. Work Programme

It was agreed that the Task Force Priorities would be added to the agenda for the next meeting, as previously suggested by the Chair.

The Task Force discussed the April meeting, which fell into the pre-election period of heightened political sensitivity, however it was agreed that the meeting could go ahead provided sufficient guidance was given.

It was proposed that the Task Force seek to amend its Terms of Reference, via General Services Committee, to create a second business representative position to be filled by a representative appointed by Thurrock Business Board. Whilst the Port of Tilbury would have key interests in the Lower Thames Crossing scheme this additional post sought to balance the representation in line with the two independent resident representatives, and provide a voice to the wider business population within Thurrock. The current business representative assured the Committee that he had relayed concerns from a number of businesses up to this point. The Committee agreed to make the request of General Services Committee.

The meeting finished at 7.10 pm

Approved as a true and correct record

CHAIR

DATE

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Democratic Services at Direct.Democracy@thurrock.gov.uk**

This page is intentionally left blank

Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

Briefing Note: Update on liaison with Highways England

Purpose of the briefing note: To provide background on the ongoing engagement between Thurrock Council and Highways England.

1.1 Following the Preferred Route Announcement last summer, Highways England has had a series of ad hoc contacts with Thurrock Council. Thurrock has been keen to ensure appropriate, regular and consistent interaction in order to challenge and review substantive items. Since September 2017 the LTC Task Force has continued to reinforce to Highways England the requirement for their structured engagement.

Officers continue to emphasise concern to Highways England that the Preferred Route Announcement (PRA) choice was unsound and that there is no contemporary evidence base that justifies the scheme. Equally, Officers continue to demand that Highways England fully reflect local demands for better design, all appropriate mitigation and removal of harm caused by the scheme such that any eventual Application captures the full scheme impacts and cost to Thurrock.

1.2 Ward Member Meetings

Consultants on behalf of Highways England have been undertaking a series of meetings with Councillors. Highways England has been asked for details of the content of these meetings along with the outcomes and key points raised. Highways England are now providing advance notification of when such meetings take place and it has been requested that in future such meeting might be supported by Officers whenever possible. Highways England is now providing a simple summary note for each of those meetings which we have asked be validated by the respective Councillors.

1.3 Other contact with Highways England

Weekly 'Technical Meetings' are now being set up between Thurrock Officers and consultants working on behalf of Highways England.

The following have been considered to date:

- Visual Impacts
- Impact on local roads

The content of these meetings will include all the respective priorities of the Task Force as well as specific items as demanded within the Planning process.

The above excludes various emails and ad hoc phone calls.

For any questions regarding this briefing note, please contact:

Name: Steve Cox, Corporate Director of Place
John Lamb, Interim Assistant Director – Lower Thames Crossing

Lower Thames Crossing Task Force Action List

Action	Responsible	Status	Due
September meeting			
Councillor B. Little asked if it would be possible for Thurrock to have access to information regarding its own areas. The information would be made available where possible, some could not yet be released as it was still undergoing Highways England's internal assurance policies.	HE	HE is currently reviewing the traffic data for the whole of Thurrock and we hope to be able to provide this soon.	The baseline data will be provided in mid-February, subject to the signing of the Non-Disclosure Agreement. Once signed this can be shared for Thurrock Council use only.
Councillor Piccolo requested data showing the figures for traffic originating in Thurrock or whose final destination was Thurrock, to assess the percentage of traffic that was actually related to Thurrock itself.	HE	HE is currently reviewing the traffic data for the whole of Thurrock and we hope to be able to provide this soon.	We will be able to share this information with you in the summer 2018.
The Orsett Cock roundabout would be used by DP World traffic too, so he asked whether it might be possible to move the junction further east to mitigate the number of HGVs forced onto the Orsett Cock roundabout and roads nearby. The Highways England representative agreed to liaise with the engineering department for a response to these points.	HE	<p>HE is focused on developing the preferred route which was announced in April 2017. Further refinement work is ongoing.</p> <p>With the latest scheme the Orsett Cock roundabout movements are not affected because the A128/LTC junction link has been removed.</p> <p>The updated LTC/A13 Junction is located to allow for weaving on the A13 between adjacent junctions which are already at their minimum weaving length.</p>	Answered 17.11.17 but can be discussed further at future technical meetings.

October Meeting			
Updated Survey data	HE	The baseline surveys are ongoing and commenced in August. Once the traffic model is available the relevant air quality assessment and modelling will be undertaken, which we will then share.	The collection of the air quality data is due to conclude in August 2018, with a further few months required for laboratory analysis and data processing (bias adjustment). Once this process is complete (anticipated for Autumn 2018) the information can be shared.
The Vice-Chair asked for clarification around the scheme design, such as the possibility of 'cut and cover' or tunnels. He felt the proposal to have sections of the route elevated to 5-8m would hardly be conducive to minimise the impact on residents. He also noted ambiguity as to whether there would be four or six lanes and requested that Highways England confirm these details. The representatives present were responsible for surveys and the EIA Scoping Report therefore did not have the requested information but it would be fed back outside of the meeting.	HE	The LTC scheme is still under development and the vertical profile is being reviewed to mitigate any potential local impact. Under the current scheme it will be dual 3 from the A2 up to the A13 junction; and dual 2 from the A13 to the M25. However, we are still reviewing the latest traffic model figures which will need to be validated.	A range of mitigation measures, e.g. local network Public Rights of Way connectivity, to be discussed at forthcoming technical meetings. Some measures are dependent on noise and air quality assessments.
Link to documents outlining decision process	HE	completed	Shared 30.10.17.
The Thames Crossing Action Group Representative requested data from Highways England as to the expected difference in air quality impact between route 3 and the A14 route.	HE	Assessments would have been undertaken for the routes that were shortlisted, including route 3. However, the A14 was discounted at an early	Answered 17.11.17.

		stage as it “performs poorly against the traffic and economic scheme objectives”. Further information will be provided next week.	
The Vice-Chair wished to ask Highways England whether the route would need to go by Chadwell-St-Mary if there were a roundabout at Tilbury, as this would serve the docks. He reiterated that the Council opposed the proposed crossing, but stressed that these questions would need to be asked if the proposal were approved	HE	HE is focused on developing the preferred route which was announced in April 2017. The LTC route will bypass Chadwell St-Mary to the north and there will be a separate link road and junction to Tilbury to the south of Chadwell St-Mary. This will result in fewer HGVs using the A1089 and reduce the traffic.	Answered 17.11.17.
The Thames Crossing Action Group representative requested the Task Force be shown a virtual reality model of the proposed route; which had been presented to other parties.	HE	The visualisation shown at SAP is outdated as the project has developed. However, we have an updated visualisation which we plan to share at the next Task Force meeting.	Information shared at a recent business event is available on the LTC website. In addition, a visualisation is due to be shared at the Task Force of 19.02.18.
He also requested full details regarding monies for remedial works on the current crossing to offer better scope on its usage. The Assistant Director of Highways & Transportation clarified that those funds would be the responsibility of a separate division of Highways England than the Lower Thames Crossing team however an update could still be obtained.	HE	Highways England’s Dartford Crossing operations team is currently looking how best to invest the extra £10m the SoS announced is being made available to invest in short term improvements at and around the Dartford Crossing. Similarly, the same team is working	Answered 17.11.17.

		on a medium term of improvements.	
November meeting			
Brian Little raised the suggestion of an 'opt-in' system for residents to allow info to be shared with their Councillors. HE advised they would seek legal advice around possibilities.	HE	HE hope to get a response to you on this by the end of the week.	Answered 08.12.17.
Gerard Rice requested large-scale maps be emailed to Members.	HE	Maps will hopefully be shared with you tomorrow.	Shared 06.12.17.
If the proposed crossing were to go ahead, Members highlighted the following essential mitigation measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More tunnelling to reduce impact • Use of cut and cover -especially adjacent to areas of population • Interchange with A13 to be put into Tunnel • Low noise surfacing • Acoustic Fencing • No out of hours working 	HE	A meeting is currently being arranged between Thurrock Council and Highways England LTC technical teams to discuss several design development options; Mitigation measures will form part of these discussions.	Answered 05.12.17.
December Meeting			
Are Ground Surveys underway in Baker Street?	HE		Answered 17.01.18. General information provided in survey schedules which are shared approximately once every fortnight.
Small updates around any changes under consideration to be presented at each meeting rather than an entirely changed diagram in 3-6m.	HE		Answered 17.01.18.
Response to Business Case as to why a crossing further East was discounted	HE		Answered 17.01.18.
Opportunities to influence route / design; where, when, how. A detailed map with possible areas of influence	HE		Discussed at Task Force meeting of 22.01.18.

Technical Design Team to attend January Meeting of TF	HE		Attended Task Force meeting of 22.01.18.
Tim Jones – to update progress around declassification of A1089	HE		Date to be advised.
Calendar of surveys, works etc	HE		Ongoing – survey schedules are shared approximately once every fortnight.

This page is intentionally left blank

Thurrock Lower Thames Crossing Task Force - Summary of Key Priorities

While Thurrock Council remains opposed to the proposed Lower Thames Crossing (LTC) being developed by Highways England in the Borough, as part of the response to the Preferred Route Announcement, Thurrock Council established a cross party 'Lower Thames Crossing Task Force' which included representation of local residents, the business community and the local action group opposing the scheme.

The following list captures some of the most frequently raised concerns, issues and priorities associated with the project to date. Thurrock Council and the Task Force remain opposed to the Highway England development of a crossing in this location. However the list below is intended to illustrate the real cost of the LTC on Thurrock and its communities and if Highways England take these seriously and factor the cost of remedy it will fundamentally affect the Business Case for the scheme. This can be read in conjunction with the Thurrock response to PINS.

It is without prejudice and those attending the Task Force will keep this list under review as and when HE provides additional information.

1. Business Case

- a. How much of this scheme is
 - i. Time savings for trips already on the road network?
 - ii. Real jobs and growth and how much of this will be in Thurrock?
 - iii. Simply creating more journeys by car and longer trips?
 - iv. If jobs was the highest priority (not a few minutes shaved off M25 journey times) how would this scheme compare to say a Crossing at Canvey?
- b. Who is to fund the entirety of the scheme?
- c. Tilbury Docks link road
 - i. Is this confirmed as part of the core 'funded' project?
 - ii. HE must design – for genuine consultation – a dual carriageway
 - iii. There are notable views as to the relative merits of downgrading the A1089. What are HE proposals and how will HE manage this sensitivity.
- d. When can local contractors access all current and future HE contracts?

2. Involvement of Thurrock Council

- a. HE to commence full and detailed technical assessment with Thurrock Officers and how each and every scheme aspects is genuinely captured by HE and local harm fully mitigated and costed in their current understanding of their proposal.
- b. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project HE must
 - i. Accept that this scheme must be scrutinised in exactly the same manner as other NSIP's such as Purfleet, Tilbury 2 etc. albeit the sheer scale, impact and potential lack of benefit to Thurrock makes this all the more concerning.
 - ii. As developer, understand the full and significant impacts on Officer resources and democratic time and our ability to respond in advancing *any* Application of a DCO.

3. Alternatives to this proposal

- a. The Planning Inspectorate has demanded these be set out – when will HE share with Thurrock how they intend this respond?
- b. All the historic crossing capacity (1963, 1980, 1991). This crossing will last 120 years at least. Will there ever be anything other than more and more roads when there is a need to safeguard and future proof for alternatives modes.

4. What is the scheme and how will the network operate?

- a. When will we know the precise capacity of the crossing? This has already become 3 lanes through the tunnel, then up to the A13 but no detail thereafter.
- b. What is the capacity of the Tilbury Docks Link road and will the proposed design work?
- c. M25 / A2 Junction will be diversion point for the LTC; then back on to the M25. Can you prove that the entire network will be able to cope and that LTC does not simply create a new connection but with roads and junction either side at gridlock?

5. Design of the new Crossing

- a. HE to provide detail of when and where Thurrock can genuinely influence HE proposals. HE must demonstrate where we can or cannot influence the scheme. The DCO process demands genuine consultation rather than keep telling us what you have decided.
- b. The tunnel portal as currently described is within the SSSI. HE must undertake full assessment (now) to adequately consider and respond to demands that it stay in tunnel until North of the railway line (*a key concern of the taskforce*).
- c. HE must provide alternative options for tunnelling and cut and cover at all junctions and sensitive areas. These worked up options to be discussed in detail with Thurrock Council prior to the Application for the DCO.
- d. All slips to have detailed designs developed for cut and cover as now being developed north of Thurrock on the M25. These designs to be open for genuine consultation and consideration by Thurrock Council.
- e. The legacy impact of road elevations – especially over the MarDyke valley needs to be fully recognised and addressed. A detailed understanding of the potential for cut and cover instead of highly elevated structures is needed including areas such as Chadwell St Mary, Orsett, Baker Street, Stifford Clays / Blackshots, Ockendon, Bulphan.
- f. More detail is needed beyond the current red line boundary and we need to have guarantees that HE is designing in robust mitigation including significant planting (5-10 metres) either side of the road (for masking the road, wild life protection, and creation of new community links for cycling, walking and equestrians).
- g. Where is HE's construction plan in terms of access routes / haul routes to enable construction to commence.

6. Incident Management

- a. Action needed now on current gridlock – can HE lobby DfT for strategic action.
- b. The incident management, delay in response and absence of smart management (including alerts, roadside information, recovery) is not as good as elsewhere in the country (i.e. as now being developed in the West Midlands). Why is it worth spending

£6bn for a new crossing and not £60m for state of the art integrated traffic control 24/7 covering the current crossing and local road either side.

- c. Full Borough wide traffic micro-simulation is needed to understand the knock on effect of incidents on either network. Any new crossing is a decade away – so requires action now, especially with planned housing growth.
- d. Will the new crossing allow tankers to cross without escorts given currently delays?

7. Environmental, ecological and health impacts

- a. The severance of the new road – visual and communities will create separation and segregation especially in historic settings such as Coal House Fort.
- b. Construction impacts of noise, dust and road traffic need to be fully mitigated especially given the prevailing SW wind.
- c. The visual intrusion demands a maximum tunnelling and the remainder fully screened.
- d. More road trips will result in greater pollution than would otherwise be the case and an air quality assessment must be undertaken.
- e. A Full Health Impact Assessment must be produced by HE to consider the full health impact of the proposed route on local populations.
- f. Pollution models for noise, air, light and vibration must be set out for the community.
- g. How much of the Greenbelt will be lost to this scheme and how might HE mitigate the risk of making the Borough being less attractive to house builders.
- h. Each and every community, and heritage asset Including Coal House Fort, Tilbury Fort and East Tilbury Village will be irreplaceably damaged – where has HE experienced and mitigated this across its many years of experience.

8. Consultation

- a. HE has adopted approaches to consultation that removed over 10,000 voices against this scheme. Can HE confirm that they will work more transparently in the future to ensure genuine consultation and show how Thurrock can genuinely influence the scheme?
- b. HE has yet to produce a detailed consultation timeline and the approaches to the Council and local community have lacked any visible plan, and appear ad hoc. When can we have presented a clear communication strategy?
- c. When will HE provide a basic 'fly through' of the current proposals as used in other schemes? Even if this subsequently changes it has been six months since the PRA.
- d. When can detailed drawings be presented to allow local communities to be informed?

9. Tolling

- a. The Thurrock Community that will be impacted by nearly 2/3 of the scheme should receive a share of the proceeds to reflect the ongoing harm of the crossing and its traffic.
- b. The Dartford Crossing has already paid for itself and local residents and businesses should receive toll free crossings.

This page is intentionally left blank

Lower Thames Crossing Task Force

Briefing Note: Lower Thames Crossing Resource Requirements

Purpose of the briefing note: To provide background on how Thurrock will invest to ensure the Lower Thames Crossing proposals are appropriately challenged and any eventual Development Consent Order (DCO) Application is mitigated.

- 1.1 Thurrock Council has a statutory responsibility to respond to Highways England's proposed crossing of the Thames. As a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project the impact on Thurrock will be extensive and it is crucial that Thurrock fully assesses and scrutinises all aspects of the proposals
- 1.2 In order to hold Highways England to account Thurrock Council has made available £380,000 to challenge, investigate, and seek appropriate changes to location, design and operation of the scheme as well as fully understand and influence the environmental and social impacts.
- 1.3 Thurrock Council is engaged in discussions with Highways England and in due course the Council will be required to formally respond as part of the statutory process. Through the selection and appointment of specific expertise Thurrock intends to protect its position and safeguard the local community and natural environment from inappropriate development.
- 1.4 Resources will ensure
 - A thorough review of all key scheme components to determine the nature of impact and how any impact might be mitigated. This would include all key elements expected within an Environmental Statement for a road scheme including:-
 - Traffic Impacts across the strategic road network and local road network and consideration of alternative strategies including development of local and strategic public transport;
 - Health impact assessment;
 - Air quality and noise;

- The physical scheme impacts including impacts to environment, bio-diversity, geology and flooding;
- Landscape impacts, visual intrusion, community severance, cultural impacts;
- Economic Impacts including analysis of where there is potential value to the local Thurrock Economy
- Planning Expertise to ensure Highways England, as Applicant, complies with all relevant planning process
- Expert guidance to the Task Force and local members as to how the scheme might be modified, mitigated or improved and the appropriate strategy for securing this from Highways England.

1.5 Thurrock Council's approach to investments as set out in the Treasury Management Strategy has enabled this funding to be made available. It will support the Council in making its statutory response to the DCO and ensure the priorities set by the task Force are reflected by Highways England in the justification for the scheme and all appropriate mitigation.

For any questions regarding this briefing note, please contact:

Name: Steve Cox, Corporate Director of Place
John Lamb, Interim Assistant Director – Lower Thames Crossing

**Lower Thames Crossing Task Force
Work Programme
2017/18**

Dates of Meetings: TBC (Monthly)

Topic	Lead Officer	Requested by Officer/Member
19 February 2018		
Highways England Action List	Highways England	Officers
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Review of Task Force Priorities	Steve Cox / John Lamb	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
19 March 2018		
Highways England Action List	Highways England	Officers
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Q1/2018 report to Cabinet	Chair	Members
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers
23 April 2018		
(Non-Political Statement)		
Highways England Action List	Highways England	Officers
Highways England Update	Highways England	Officers
Work Programme	Democratic Services	Officers

Updated: January 2018

This page is intentionally left blank